



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/369,490	08/05/1999	ERIC O. BODNAR	SF/0027.01	6852
22470	7590	09/19/2005	EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP			ZIA, SYED	
P O BOX 366			ART UNIT	
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			PAPER NUMBER	
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/369,490

Applicant(s)

BODNAR, ERIC O.

Examiner

Syed Zia

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 89-106 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 89-106 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to amendment filed on June 14, 2005. Original application contained Claims 1-50. Applicant previously cancelled claims 1-50. Applicant previously added and cancelled claims 51-88, and also previously added new claims 89-106. Applicant currently amended Claims 93, and 101. The amendments filed on June 14, 2005 have been entered. Therefore, presently pending claims are 89-106.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed on June 14, 2005 have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 89-106 have been considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 89-106 applicants argued that the applicant did not find “*in Butler or Larson any suggestion or teaching to modify a voice processor to enforce system administrator policies for users at login*” and “*motivation ignores how the voice processor works*”.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Art Unit: 2131

In this case, Cited prior art, Butler, clearly teaches browser content and tag-based voice processing system for allowing telephone user to access WWW pages from internet that has voice application HTML tags inserted in HTML documents which provide commands and data required to form voice application. A processing unit runs a voice application. A data communications network input/output port is connected to a data communications network accessing Hyper-Text Mark-Up Language (HTML) documents. At least one of the HTML documents has voice application HTML tags inserted in it. The tags provide the commands and data required to form the voice application. This system integrates voice application and HTML pages together more closely. Allows same HTML document to be accessible to both computer users via graphical Web browser and to telephone callers via voice browser. While the system of Larson teaches a method within a registry of the client computer where a registry parameter is obtained for the selected key defines a value name comprising a name value and a data value. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Butler and Larson, because Larson's method of building system registry for applications using name/value pair would not only provide an extensible and portable mechanism for parent application (such as voice processing system) for applying parent application control regarding each user in a predetermined format (such as name/value pair format), but will also provide uniform mechanism of updating, and enforcing a particular control (policy) value and configuration for applications (parent application) for each user using the (parent) application (col. 1 line 43 to line 58).

As a result, the system of cited prior art does implement and teaches a Web client/server system providing a method for embedding context sensitive Web portal into computer application, as broadly claimed by the applicant.

Applicants still clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. Therefore, the examiner asserts that CPA does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for claims 89-106 are respectfully maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 89-93, 96-102, and 105-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Butler et al. (U. S. Patent 6,771,743).

3. Regarding claim 89, Butler teach and describe a method to schedule a method of sending messages (data communication network 3) from a web server to a parent application (voice

Art Unit: 2131

processing system 2) running on a client machine (Fig.1), the parent application having an embedded browser that communicates with the web server (col.5 line 17 line 23), the method including:

the parent application intercepting a web page sent from the web server to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37), the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30), wherein the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18);

the parent application responding to the encoded instructions by triggering a special behavior [i.e. VRU tags actions] of the parent application, distinct from displaying the [i.e. HTML document] web page (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20); and

the embedded browser displaying at least part of the web page other than the special key tags (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

4. Regarding claim 98, Butler teach and describe a method to schedule a method of sending parent application (voice processing system 2) adapted [i.e. embedding special tags] to receive messages (data communication network 3) from a web server by intercepting them [i.e. voice processing system of reading Web page tags], the parent application including:

an embedded browser, embedded in the parent application; and computer-implemented logic adapted to (col.5 line 17 line 33):

intercept a web page from the web server addressed to the embedded browser (col.5 line 33 to line 37), the web page including one or more special key tags encoded with instructions to

Art Unit: 2131

the parent application (col.5 line 23 to line 30), wherein the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags] are not HTML formatting tags (col.3 line 48 to line 53, and col.6 line 10 to line 18);

trigger special behavior [i.e. VRU tags dependent actions] of the parent application in response to the encoded instructions, distinct from displaying the web page [i.e. HTML document] (col.5 line 23 to line 32, and col.6 line 9 to line 20); and

pass to the embedded browser at least part of the intercepted web page for the embedded browser to display (col.6 line 3 to line 8).

5. Claims 90-93, 96-97 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claim 89. Furthermore, Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application (Fig.1-2): further including

As to Claim 90, the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the embedded browser for display (col.6 line 14 to line 37).

As to Claim 91, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags], wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page (col.3 line 48 to line 60, and col. 6 line 38 to line 47).

As to Claim 92, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option “1”] to configure the parent application (col. 6 line 38 to line 45).

Art Unit: 2131

As to Claim 93, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option “1”] the parent application (col. 6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 96, the special behavior of the parent application [i.e. such as voice processing], customizing the web page with user-specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page [i.e. using Dialed Number Identification Service by voice processing system to access data corresponding to user-specific information] (col.5 line 9 to line 23)

As to Claim 97, the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine [i.e. such as signal processing routine] responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags (col.5 line 33 to line 44).

6. Claims 99-103, and 105-106 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claim 98.

Furthermore, Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application (Fig.1-2) further including:

As to Claim 99, the parent application removing the special key tags from the web page and passing the revised web page to the browser for display (col.6 line 14 to line 37).

As to Claim 100, as the special behavior of the parent application, running code accessible to the client machine as instructed by the special key tags [i.e. VRU tags], wherein the code is not part of the embedded browser and not downloaded with the web page (col.3 line 48 to line 60, and col. 6 line 38 to line 47).



As to Claim 101, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option “1”] to configure the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 102, as the special behavior of the parent application, presenting a set-up dialogue to configure the parent application [i.e. retrieving info after making selection on displayed Web page, such as press option “1”] to configure the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45).

As to Claim 105, the special behavior of the parent application [i.e. such as voice processing], customizing the web page with user specific information accessible to the parent application and not provided in the intercepted web page [i.e. using Dialed Number Identification Service by voice processing system to access data corresponding to user-specific information] (col.5 line 9 to line 23).

As to Claim 106, the special behavior of the parent application, invoking a handler routine [i.e. such as signal processing routine] responsive to instructions in auxiliary information that is part of the special key tags (col.5 line 33 to line 44).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 94-95, and 103-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler et al. (U. S. Patent 6,771,743) as applied to claim 89, and 98 above, and further in view of Larson et al. (U. S. Patent 6,408,326).

Regarding Claim 94-95, and 103-104 Butler teach and describe embedding context sensitive Web portal in an application, such as voice processing system with special tags (Fig.1-2, and abstract)

Although the system and method disclosed by Butler shows all the features of the claimed limitation, such as special behavior of the parent application (col.6 line 38 to line 45) but Butler does not specifically disclose modifying a name/value pair of system registry entry corresponding to the parent application.

In an analogous art, Larson, on the other hand discloses computing environment that relates to system and method to administer network environment for application programs that can write registry parameters in a binary name/value pair format (Larson: Abstract).

- modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent application, and the system registry entry includes at least one name/value pair (Larson: Abstract, col.1 line 15 to line 52).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Butler and Larson, because Larson's method of building system registry for applications using name/value pair would not only provide an extensible and portable mechanism for parent application (such as voice processing system) for applying parent application control regarding each user in a predetermined format (such as name/value pair

Art Unit: 2131

format), but will also provide uniform mechanism of updating, and enforcing a particular control (policy) value and configuration for applications (parent application) for each user using the (parent) application.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SZ

September 9, 2005

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100